



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,136	12/28/1999	THOMAS F. BERGERT		9633
7590	05/07/2004		EXAMINER	
THOMAS F BERGERT 4436 N 17TH STREET ARLINGTON, VA 22207			KALINOWSKI, ALEXANDER G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/473,136	Applicant(s)	BERGERT, THOMAS F.
Examiner	Alexander Kalinowski	Art Unit	3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination. Applicant presented an amendment filed on 3/1/2004, deleting claims 10 and 12 and amending claims 1, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18 and 20-23. In light of Applicant's amendment of the claims the Examiner withdraws the outstanding rejection of claims 1-23 based on 35 USC 103. in addition the Examiner withdraws the rejection of claims 1-16, 21, and 23 based on 35 USC 101. However, new grounds of rejection for claims 1-9, 11, and 12-23 based on 35 USC 103 are established in the instant office action necessitated by Applicant's amendment and therefore, the rejection is a final rejection of the claims.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Examiner notes that Applicant amended claims 1, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18 and 20-23 adding a limitation that was not present in the previously pending claims. Newly found prior art was used to establish new grounds of rejection of claims 1-9, 11, and 13-23 as set forth in detail in the next section below.

3. The Examiner withdraws the grounds of rejection of claims 1-16, 21, and 23 based on 35 USC 101 in light of Applicant's amendment of claims 1 and 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al.. Pat. No. 5,596,636 in view of Durand et al., Pat. No. 6,272,467 (hereinafter Durand) and Romenesko, James, "Saint Paul Pioneer Press, Minn., Hot List Column" (hereinafter Teemaster) and Henneuse et al., Pat. No. 5,963,913.

As to claim 1, Davies discloses a method of arranging a recreational outing for participants, implemented by a server application (see Fig. 1 and abstract), comprising the steps of:

a) providing a database of information including reservation information, said reservation information including at least one selection option, said option including a time and a date for an activity from at least one recreational facility (i.e. golf course host computer database ... reservation date and time ...)(Fig.1 and col. 3, lines 33-39 and col. 4, lines 20-35);

b) receiving a selection from a first one of said participants using a client application of a selection option (i.e. home computer ... user enters date ... user enters exact time ... the user programs specific desired reservation information to be transmitted)(col. 4, lines 3-11 and 20-40).

Davies does not explicitly disclose said database further including profile information for a plurality of participants, said profile information for each of said plurality of participants including at least one element

- c) receiving indication information including a selection from said first participant of at least one element corresponding to an element of said profile information of at least one additional participant;
- d) determining a subset of participants from said database of participants having said profile element; and
- e) communicating said selection to said subset of participants (i.e. links to the matches)(col. 8, lines 17-21.

However, Davies does disclose communicating with participants (i.e. messages may be broadcast to all unit users or individual users)(col. 5, lines 33-35). Durand discloses said database further including profile information for a plurality of participants, said profile information for each of said plurality of participants including at least one element (i.e. profile database, preference subrecord)(col. 7, lines 46-51). In addition, Durand discloses receiving indication information including a selection from said first participant of at least one element corresponding to an element of said profile information of at least one additional participant (i.e. ... communicate traits he or she desires in a match .. Profile database (see Fig. 3B and col. 6, lines 25-45). Furthermore, Durand discloses determining a subset of participants from said database of participants having said profile element (col. 6, lines 35-40 and col. 18, lines 15-22). Finally, Durand discloses communicating said selection to said subset of participants

(col. 19, lines 32-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include said database further including profile information for a plurality of participants, said profile information for each of said plurality of participants including at least one element, c) receiving indication information including a selection from said first participant of at least one element corresponding to an element of said profile information of at least one additional participant, d) determining a subset of participants from said database of participants having said profile element; and e) communicating said selection to said subset of participants as disclosed by Durand within the Davies method for the motivation of matching traits with corresponding preferences that insures that only matches with the highest degree of compatibility are made (col. 2, lines 58-66).

Davies and Durand do not explicitly disclose reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option: and retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation.

However, Teemaster discloses reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities (i.e. booking tee times ... make reservations at various Twin cities golf courses ...)(see entire document). Teemaster also discloses receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option (i.e. use the Internet to find tee times ... a search engine helps golfers find courses based on

Art Unit: 3626

difficulty, price ...)(entire document). Furthermore, Teemaster discloses retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation (i.e. golfer can make phone or online reservations ...)(see entire document).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option and retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation as disclosed by Teemaster within Davies and Durand for the motivation of providing a fast and speedy means for making tee time reservations (i.e. frustration with booking tee times ...)(first three paragraphs).

(i.e. reservation time and date ...)(col. 4, lines 20-30).

Davies, Durand, and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose

(h) receiving acceptance information from said at least one other participant using a client computer.

(i) after receiving said acceptance information in step h) receiving instructions from said first participant using a client computer to book a reservation for the time and date and facility connected with said selection option

However, Henneuse discloses receiving acceptance information from said at least one other participant using a client computer (col. 3, lines 59-67). In addition , Henneuse discloses after receiving said acceptance information in step h) receiving instructions from said first participant using a client computer to book a reservation for

the time and date and facility connected with said selection option (i.e. venue scheduling)(col. 4, lines 31-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitations as disclosed by Henneuse within the Davies, Durand, and Teemaster method for the motivation of using accurate availability information to schedule an event (col. 1, lines 38-42 and col. 2, line 4-23).

As to claim 2, Davies does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said element is an element taken from the group of elements consisting of : a hobby, an occupation, an age range, a gender, an income level.

However, Durand discloses said element is an element taken from the group of elements consisting of : a hobby, an occupation, an age range, a gender, an income level (i.e. maximum-age, minimum_age)(Fig. 3b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include grouping players according to their profiles as disclosed by Durand within Davies for the motivation of matching traits with corresponding preferences that insures that only matches with the highest degree of compatibility are made (col. 2, lines 58-66).

As to claim 3, Davies, Durand, and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said indication information includes an electronic mail address of at least one other participant.

However, Henneuse discloses said indication information includes an electronic mail address of at least one other participant (col. 3, lines 15-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Henneuse within the Davies, Durand, and Teemaster method for the motivation stated for claim 1.

As to claim 5, Davies, Durand, and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the identity of said first participant.

However, Henneuse discloses said step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the identity of said first participant (see Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the identity of said first participant as disclosed by Henneuse within the Davies, Durand, and Teemaster method for the motivation stated for claim 1.

As to claim 9, Davies discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said activity is golf and said at least one recreational facility is a golf course facility (see abstract).

As to claim 11, Davies discloses the method of claim 1 including the further step of communicating said booked reservation to said facility connected with said selection option (i.e. home computer ... user enters date ... user enters exact time ... the user

programs specific desired reservation information to be transmitted)(col. 4, lines 3-11 and 20-40).

As to claim 13, Davies discloses the method of claim 1 including the further step of communicating said booked reservation to said facility connected with said selection option (i.e. home computer ... user enters date ... user enters exact time ... the user programs specific desired reservation information to be transmitted)(col. 4, lines 3-11 and 20-40).

6. Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies, Durand, Teemaster and Henneuse as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Zhang et al., Pat. No. 6,016,478 (hereinafter Zhang).

As to claim 14, Davies, Durand, Teemaster and Henneuse do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1 including, between steps (b) and (c), the step of creating an event reply page responsive to said selection, said event reply page having available slots, and wherein step (d) includes sending an electronic mail message to said at least one other participant providing a link to the event reply page.

However, Zhang discloses the step of creating an event reply page responsive to said selection, said event reply page having available slots (i.e. HTML form as a scheduling invitation ... the accept and decline responses are mapped to HTML

buttons)(col. 44, line 63 - col. 45, line 20). Furthermore, Zhang discloses includes sending an electronic mail message to said at least one other participant providing a link to the event reply page)(see Fig. 13 and col. 44, line 63 - col. 45, line 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include between steps (b) and (c), the step of creating an event reply page responsive to said selection, said event reply page having available slots, and wherein step (d) includes sending an electronic mail message to said at least one other participant providing a link to the event reply page as disclosed by Zhang within the Davies, Durand, and Henneuse method for the motivation of scheduling appointments with other members of a group (col. 1, line 66 - col. 2, line 5).

As to claim 16, Davies, Durand, and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 14 including the further step of receiving one or more reply confirmations from said at least one other participant using a client application.

However, Henneuse discloses receiving one or more reply confirmations from said at least one other participant using a client application (col. 4, lines 1-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Henneuse within the Davies, Durand, and Teemaster method for the motivation stated for claim 1.

7. Claims 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of GolfAgent, Teemaster, Henneuse and Kasavana, Michael L, "Making more hours in the day"(hereinafter Kasavana).

As to claim 17, Davies discloses a computer system for arranging a golf outing for a plurality of participants (see abstract and Fig. 1), comprising: a network to which a first one of said participants and at least one other participant have access and across which said provider and said participants can communicate information using respective client systems (i.e. home computer ... user enters date ... user enters exact time ... the user programs specific desired reservation information to be transmitted)(\see Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 3-11 and 20-40); and a server application operable to communicate information across the network, said server application operable to: provide a database of information including reservation information, said reservation information including at least one selection option, said option including a time and a date for an activity from at least one recreational facility (i.e. database 16)(Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 37-44 and col. 4, lines 21-26); receive a selection from said first participants using a client application of a selection option (i.e. sends first option to the system)(col. 4, lines 30-40).

Davies does not explicitly disclose providing simultaneous access to said participants to reservation information related to a plurality of recreational facilities.

However, GolfAgent discloses providing simultaneous access to said participants to a database of reservation information related to a plurality of recreational facilities (Easy golf tee time bookings on the Internet, page 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include providing simultaneous access to said participants to reservation information related to a plurality of recreational facilities as disclosed by Golf Agent within Davies and Zhang for the motivation of enabling Internet users to book tee times at a wide range of golf courses (Easy golf tee time bookings on the Internet, page 1).

Davies and GolfAgent do not explicitly disclose reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option: and retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation.

However, Teemaster discloses reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities (i.e. booking tee times ... make reservations at various Twin cities golf courses ...)(see entire document). Teemaster also discloses receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option (i.e. use the Internet to find tee times ... a search engine helps golfers find courses based on difficulty, price ...)(entire document). Furthermore, Teemaster discloses retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation (i.e. golfer can make phone or online reservations

...)(see entire document).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option and retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation as disclosed by Teemaster within Davies and GolfAgent for the motivation of providing a fast and speedy means for making tee time reservations (i.e. frustration with booking tee times ...)(first three paragraphs).

Davies, GolfAgent and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose

a number of openings available for one or more individuals to join said activity and

receive indication information from said first participant using a client computer, said indication information including information necessary to notify a number of individuals of said selection, said number of individuals greater than said number of available openings.

However, Henneuse discloses a number of openings available for one or more individuals to join said activity and receive indication information from said first participant using a client computer, said indication information including information necessary to notify a number of individuals of said selection, said number of individuals greater than said number of available openings (i.e. generate one or more potential schedules along with requested individuals ... matching participants to scheduling options and evaluating the different scheduling options ... notifies available participant

... notifies unavailable participant)(col. 4, lines 1-18 and 41-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Henneuse within the Davies, GolfAgent, and Teemaster method for the motivation stated for claim 1.

As to claim 22, GolfAgent , Davies and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose the system of claim 17 wherein said server is further operable to communicate said selection to said number of individuals.

However, Davies does disclose communicating with participants (i.e. messages may be broadcast to all unit users or individual users)(col. 5, lines 33-35). Moreover, Henneuse discloses communicate said selection to said number of individuals (col. 3, lines 46-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Henneuse within the GolfAgent, Davies and Teemaster method for the motivation stated for claim 1.

8. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of Zhang, GolfAgent, Teemaster and Henneuse.

As to claim 18, Davies discloses a computer system for arranging a recreational outing for a plurality of participants (see Fig. 1 and abstract), comprising:

means for providing reservation information to a plurality of participants (i.e. database 16 ... sends confirmation information from the host computer for display to the user)(col. 4, lines 30-40); means for a first participant to select a desired reservation (see Fig. 2).

Davies does not explicitly disclose means for notifying at least one additional participant of said reservation.

However, Davies does disclose communicating with participants (i.e. messages may be broadcast to all unit users or individual users)(col. 5, lines 33-35). Zhang discloses means for notifying at least one additional participant of said reservation (i.e. sending to desired participants an initial meeting message)(col. 6, lines 16-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include means for notifying at least one additional participant at said reservation as disclosed by Zhang within the Davies method for the motivation of scheduling appointments with other members of a group (col. 1, line 66 - col. 2, line 5).

Davies and Zhang do not explicitly disclose

means for providing simultaneous access to and means to select a desired reservation from said reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities.

However GolfAgent discloses means for providing simultaneous access to and means to select a desired reservation from said reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities (Easy golf tee time bookings on the Internet, page 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include means for providing simultaneous access to and means to select a desired

Art Unit: 3626

reservation from said reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities as disclosed by Golf Agent within Davies and Zhang for the motivation of enabling Internet users to book tee times at a wide range of golf courses (Easy golf tee time bookings on the Internet, page 1).

Davies, Zhang and GolfAgent do not explicitly disclose reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities means for receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option: and means for retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation.

However, Teemaster discloses reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities (i.e. booking tee times ... make reservations at various Twin cities golf courses ...)(see entire document). Teemaster also discloses receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option (i.e. use the Internet to find tee times ... a search engine helps golfers find courses based on difficulty, price ...)(entire document). Furthermore, Teemaster discloses retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation (i.e. golfer can make phone or online reservations ...)(see entire document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities, means for receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option and means for retrieving and transmitting,

based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation as disclosed by Teemaster within Davies, Zhang and GolfAgent for the motivation of providing a fast and speedy means for making tee time reservations (i.e. frustration with booking tee times ...)(first three paragraphs).

Davies, Zhang, GolfAgent and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose a number of openings available for one or more individuals to join said activity and

receive indication information from said first participant using a client computer, said indication information including information necessary to notify a number of individuals of said selection, said number of individuals greater than said number of available openings.

However, Henneuse discloses a number of openings available for one or more individuals to join said activity and receive indication information from said first participant using a client computer, said indication information including information necessary to notify a number of individuals of said selection, said number of individuals greater than said number of available openings (i.e. generate one or more potential schedules along with requested individuals ... matching participants to scheduling options and evaluating the different scheduling options ... notifies available participant ... notifies unavailable participant)(col. 4, lines 1-18 and 41-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Henneuse within the Davies, Zhang, GolfAgent, and Teemaster method for the motivation stated for claim 1.

As to claim 19, Davies discloses the computer system of claim 18 further including means for said first participant to book said selected reservation (i.e. user enters reservation time and date ...)(col. 4, lines 20-30).

9. Claim 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GolfAgent in view of Davies, Teemaster and Henneuse.

As to claim 21, GolfAgent discloses a method of arranging a recreational outing for participants, comprising the steps of (i.e. Golf Club Bookings via the Internet:)(Golf Agent" Welcome Page, page 1)

- a) providing a web site including reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities, said site further including selection information, said selection information including a time and date for an activity of at least one of said recreational facilities (i.e. how to book)(Easy Golf Tee Time Bookings on the Internet, page 1);
- b) providing a plurality of said participants with simultaneous access to said reservation information and said selection information facilities (Easy Golf Tee Time Bookings on the Internet, page 1);
- c) upon receiving a request from one of said participants, retrieving and transmitting to said first participant selection information pertaining to at least one

available reservation facilities (i.e. how to book)(Easy Golf Tee Time Bookings on the Internet, page 1);

d) receiving a selection from said participant from said selection information in
c)facilities (i.e. how to book)(Easy Golf Tee Time Bookings on the Internet, page 1);
GolfAgent does not explicitly disclose

a database of reservation information for a recreational facility.

However, Davies discloses a database of reservation information for a recreational facility (i.e. golf course host computer database ... reservation date and time ...)(Fig.1 and col. 3, lines 33-39 and col. 4, lines 20-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include a database of reservation information for a recreational facility as disclosed by Davies within GolfAgent for the motivation of simultaneous access to reservation information (col. 2, lines 1-5 and col. 4, lines 3-11).

GolfAgent and Davies do not explicitly disclose
reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities
receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option: and

retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation.

However, Teemaster discloses reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities (i.e. booking tee times ... make reservations at various Twin cities golf courses ...)(see entire document). Teemaster also discloses receiving a non-

specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option (i.e. use the Internet to find tee times ... a search engine helps golfers find courses based on difficulty, price ...) (entire document). Furthermore, Teemaster discloses retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation (i.e. golfer can make phone or online reservations ...) (see entire document). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include reservation information for a plurality of recreational facilities receiving a non-specific request pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one selection option and retrieving and transmitting, based on said received request, at least one selection option pertaining to at least one available reservation as disclosed by Teemaster within GolfAgent and Davies for the motivation of providing a fast and speedy means for making tee time reservations (i.e. frustration with booking tee times ...) (first three paragraphs).

GolfAgent, Davies and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose

a number of openings available for one or more individuals to join said activity and

receive indication information from said first participant using a client computer, said indication information including information necessary to notify a number of individuals of said selection, said number of individuals greater than said number of available openings.

However, Henneuse discloses a number of openings available for one or more individuals to join said activity and receive indication information from said first

participant using a client computer, said indication information including information necessary to notify a number of individuals of said selection, said number of individuals greater than said number of available openings (i.e. generate one or more potential schedules along with requested individuals ... matching participants to scheduling options and evaluating the different scheduling options ... notifies available participant ... notifies unavailable participant)(col. 4, lines 1-18 and 41-57). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Henneuse within the GolfAgent, Davies and Teemaster method for the motivation stated for claim 1.

As to claim 23, GolfAgent, Davies, and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose

f) communicating said selection to said number of individuals.

However, Davies does disclose communicating with participants (i.e. messages may be broadcast to all unit users or individual users)(col. 5, lines 33-35). Moreover, Henneuse discloses communicate said selection to said number of individuals (col. 3, lines 46-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Henneuse within the GolfAgent, Davies and Teemaster method for the motivation stated for claim 1.

Art Unit: 3626

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies, Durand, Teemaster and Henneuse as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kasavana, Michael L, "Making more hours in the day"(hereinafter Kasavana).

As to claim 4, Davies discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the time and date of said selection (i.e. reservation time and date ...)(col. 4, lines 20-30).

Davies, Durand, and Teemaster do not explicitly disclose

communicating said selection includes providing information as to the facility location of said selection.

However, Kasavana discloses communicating said selection includes providing information as to the facility location of said selection (i.e. typically, the system prompts the member for their ... desired start time and course specification)(page 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include communicating said selection includes providing information as to the facility location of said selection as disclosed by Kasavana within the Davies, Durand, Teemaster and Henneuse combination for the motivation of optimizing golf course operations (page 6, sixth paragraph).

11. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies, Durand, Teemaster , and Henneuse as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Diaz, Christina Valdez, "Road Warriors plot their course early"(hereinafter Diaz).

Art Unit: 3626

As to claim 6, Davies and Durand do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the directions to the physical location of said recreational facility.

However, Diaz discloses said step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the directions to the physical location of said recreational facility (i.e. area map)(page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include said step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the directions to the physical location of said recreational facility as disclosed by Diaz within the Davies, Durand, Teemaster, and Henneuse combination for the motivation of finding a golf course in an unfamiliar city (page 2, paragraphs 1 and 2).

As to claim 7, Davies, Durand, Teemaster, and Henneuse do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein said database of reservation information is received from said at least one recreational facility using a client application and includes a pricing schedule.

However, Diaz discloses said database of reservation information is received from said at least one recreational facility using a client application and includes a pricing schedule (i.e. cost)(page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include said database of reservation information is received from said at least one recreational facility using a client application and includes a pricing schedule as disclosed by Diaz within the Davies and

Durand, TeeMaster and Henneuse combination for the motivation of finding a golf course in an unfamiliar city (page 2).

12. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies, Durand, Teemaster, Henneuse and Diaz as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of the

Examiner's use of Official Notice.

As to claim 8, Davies, Durand and Diaz do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 7 wherein said pricing schedule includes prices which vary depending upon the hour of the reservation selection, and wherein said step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the time and price of said selection, said price being determined by the associated time of the selection.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the reservation arts to vary prices of scheduled events according to whether the booked event was scheduled to occur during prime time (i.e. peak demand) or off demand. The purpose of varying the prices of the reserved event was to maximize the revenue stream generated by reservations over a period of time by increasing the price of the event when demand is at its greatest and people are willing to pay more for a reservation while lowering the price during off peak hours when the demand for the event is reduced. For example, theaters vary ticket prices to a movie according to the time of day that the movie is scheduled to be shown. Matinee tickets are lower priced tickets for those times the movie is shown when demand for the tickets is reduced,

Art Unit: 3626

typically before 6 pm. Movie ticket prices for the same movie shown after matinee hours are higher since customers are more apt to attend movies in the evening for convenience sake even though ticket prices are higher. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include said pricing schedule includes prices which vary depending upon the hour of the reservation selection, and wherein said step of communicating said selection includes providing information as to the time and price of said selection, said price being determined by the associated time of the selection within the Davies, Durand, Teemaster, Henneuse and Diaz combination for the motivation of maximizing the revenue stream generated by reservations over a period of time.

13. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies, Durand, Teemaster and Henneuse as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Kasavana.

As to claim 15, Davies, Durand, Teemaster, and Henneuse do not explicitly disclose the method of claim 14 wherein said event reply page includes at most three available slots.

However, Kasavana discloses a golf scheduling system based on accepting reservations for foursomes thereby disclosing the requirement of the system to define a reservation that includes four members (page 6, paragraph 3). Furthermore, Kasavana discloses that a reservation can be entered by entering the names of the members of a group. Therefore, Kasavana discloses that for a valid reservation to be accepted,

Art Unit: 3626

besides the first participant, at most three additional participants may be added to the reservation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include wherein said event reply page includes at most three available slots as taught by Kasavana within the Davies, Durand, Teemaster and Henneuse combination for the motivation of optimizing golf course operations (page 6, sixth paragraph).

14. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies, Zhang, GolfAgent, Teemaster and Henneuse as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Kasavana.

As to claim 20, Davies, Zhang, GolfAgent, and Henneuse do not explicitly disclose the system of claim 18 wherein said means for confirming acceptance is limited to receiving at most three acceptances.

However, Kasavana discloses a golf scheduling system based on accepting reservations for foursomes thereby disclosing the requirement of the system to define a reservation that includes four members (page 6, paragraph 3). Furthermore, Kasavana discloses that a reservation can be entered by entering the names of the members of a group. Therefore, Kasavana discloses that for a valid reservation to be accepted, besides the first participant, at most three additional participants may be added to the reservation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include said means for confirming acceptance is limited to receiving at most three acceptances as taught by Kasavana within the Davies, Zhang,

GolfAgent, and Teemaster combination for the motivation of optimizing golf course operations (page 6, sixth paragraph).

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Kalinowski, whose telephone number is (703) 305-2398. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. In addition, the examiner can be reached on alternate Fridays.

If any attempt to reached the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached on (703) 305-9588. The fax

Art Unit: 3626

telephone number for this group is (703) 305-7687 (for official communications including After Final communications labeled "Box AF").

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 7th Floor, receptionist.



Alexander Kalinowski

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3626

5/2/2004